

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/009,530 | 01/22/2002 | Trevor Martin | 124-909 4032 | | |
| 75 | 7590 07/13/2004 | | EXAMINER | | |
| Nixon & Vanderhye 8th Floor | | | ANDERSON, MATTHEW A | | |
| 1100 North Glebe Road | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| Arlington, VA 22201-4714 | | | 1765 | | |
| | | | DATE MAIL ED: 07/13/200 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | $(2\sqrt{7})$ | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 10/009,530 | MARTIN ET AL. | | | | | |
| , | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | Matthew A. Anderson | 1765 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | lress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF f extension and the corresponding amo | g date of the final reject HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the appr unt of the fee. The app | ion. See MPEP ropriate extension | | | | |
| fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | e later than three months after the mail FR 1.704(b). | ling date of the final reje | Office action; or ection, even if | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF | R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | | | | | | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | | |
| NOTE: | | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection | | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | o issues which were | e newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo | | | and an | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>5-6</u> . | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| 8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appr | oved or b) disapproved by tl | ne Examiner. | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen | t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | | |
| | 0.4 | | | | | | |
| | SUPE | PINES NORTON | MINER | | | | |
| | Na | 12 | nan <i>a</i> eli | | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant has overlooked the fact that the Goodhue reference teaches both CBE and MBE as methods useable to achieve tapered layers. Combined as previously presented by the examiner, this suggests growing tapered epitaxial layers by CBE (Chemical Beam Epitaxy) using mechanical masks. The references cited by the examiner were used in the rejection as previously stated..